THE New Republic

How to Conduct A Conversation
by Roy H. Hoopes

Page 15

Whodunit?

A scholarly suggestion that if Congress wants to search history for villains, it should ask the help of some scholars

by ERNEST R. MAY

Japan and China . . . . . *Shao Chuan Leng*
Bring Me My Mail! . . . . . *Gerald W. Johnson*
The Dear Dead Days . . . . . *Frank Getlein*
Runaway Soviet Literary Revolt? . . . . . *George Gibian*
Presidential Disability . . . . . *Peter Frelinghuysen Jr.*

APRIL 22, 1957 25c

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Wire

The Norman Suicide

WHAT THE public doesn't understand is the economic law of diminishing returns in witch-hunting. It accounts, probably, for the suicide of Herbert Norman, Canadian Ambassador to Egypt. The two authorized, permanent Congressional witch-hunts—the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee — are becoming desperate for something to investigate.

The Communist Party is on the ropes. The McCarthy hysteria is almost dead. The competitive committees have big staffs, loads of money and are so badly pressed for victims that they are giving re-runs on old inquiries, summoning back witnesses from earlier spectaculars. They are also forced to go back further and further into the 40's and 30's as the present water level sinks. The Senate committee was so desperate it tore off the bandages on the old Norman case—and killed him. Since the two watch dogs are now a permanent part of the legislature there is no end in sight.

The Senate gave its committee $289,000 at the last distribution; the House, $330,000. All that money and no targets! (Of course the FBI does the real work—or is paid to do it; these committees are just for Congressional breast-beating.) One solution would be for the committees to pool funds and contribute half to the Communist Party. This would help keep it alive, just as hunters preserve pheasants. Ambitious, irresponsible Robert Morris notoriously runs Senator Eastland's committee. Columnist Doris Fleeson wrote of Eastland: "He is a lazy, rich Southern plantation owner who hates detail, finds Washington uncongenial and has let his Senatorial responsibility, and power slip into the eager hands of counsel Morris." (We wish there could be more writing like that from Washington.) Morris now has a dandy idea. It is to charge that Canada's Foreign Minister "Mike" Pearson, intimate of dead Norman, is tainted with Communism, too. Of course, this would infuriate Canadians still further, but so what? What do you do with all those nice faggots piling up and no native witches?

They Did Like Ike

THE EISENHOWER prestige slowly deteriorates; we don't know how far it will go. We have long pointed out the amiable do-nothingism of this Administration but the present attack comes from just that quarter which should be supporting the President. It comes from organized business which, we should think, has every reason for loving Eisenhower. It has whipped up a storm all over America against the budget which has reached a point in Congress where it endangers the whole White House program.

We have always thought business politically infantile (it hated FDR as he fought to preserve the capitalistic system, almost wrecked by Hoover) and now it seeks to push the GOP back to Taft and McKinley. It hasn't a ghost of a chance, we believe. Knowland is its fair-haired son now, but the GOP Right hasn't been able to nominate its man since Landon, in 1936, and we don't think that Senator Knowland has much chance now.

This column has defended the Eisenhower budget for a month and pointed out that, relative to population, income and national product, it isn't a bit too big. We are pleased to see that *Life* magazine has come out on our side. *Life's* support is, of course, not to be taken too seriously because intellectuals don't see it and businessmen only look at the pictures, but we should be thankful for any support and it is the spirit of the thing after all that matters.

How can you support an Administration that won't support itself? Eisenhower should have dumped Secretary Humphrey the day he attacked the budget; he should have defended the budget himself, instead of vacillating for weeks. There is a visible tendency now for the Administration to come apart at the seams. Chief effect of the business world's anti-Eisenhower budget attack, we believe, will be to enhance this trend.

There are a few signs that the nation is getting bored with the Administration. Why did the Post Office have to close down? Why with all Dulles' unction are our allies sore at us? Why does the President play golf so much? Why does he need helicopters? Why does he ask safe driving and violate traffic laws? These are naïve questions, perhaps, but nobody asked any of them a few months ago.

We sensed a cooler atmosphere in the press association accounts the other day of how reporters were arrested trying to keep up with the Eisenhower 70-mile-an-hour motorcade. The boys were so mad they even wrote that they were traveling to Eisenhower's "country estate" at Gettysburg instead of his "farm."

Non-Payment of Taxes

THE METROPOLITAN press has almost ignored the O'Mahoney-Kefauver-Carroll investigation of big US oil companies operating in the Mideast, but the fact that Aramco legally pays no federal income tax on an annual take of a quarter billion in net profits can't be downed. It now seems that the Senate Finance Committee will look into this vast tax-loophole scandal involving foreign depletion allowance and the offset of exaggerated foreign income taxes. The labor press is to be congratulated for keeping this story alive, particularly the railway brotherhoods' weekly *Labor* along with columnists Tom Stokes, Doris Fleeson and others, and radio news commentator Edward P. Morgan. This humble column has given what support it could. The nation is lucky, we think, in having these alternative news media for handling stories that press associations and most big dailies won't touch.

Notes

DENY IT as they will, GOP leaders sought and got Teamster Beck's election support in 1954 and '56. . . . Reporters gasped when Ike praised Swiss Minister-designate Henry J. Taylor last week and declared his foreign views "greatly like mine"; Taylor believes in flying saucers and considers even the British Labour party dangerously radical.

T.R.B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic

A JOURNAL OF OPINION

APRIL 22, 1957

THE WEEK 3

More Punch Per Pound; The Washing of Hands; Jordan Barometer; The Reluctant Vice President; Texas' New Junior Senator

ARTICLES 9

Bring Me My Mail!
by Gerald W. Johnson

Japan and China
by Shao Chuan Leng

Whodunit?
by Ernest R. May

A Rich and Flexible Conversation
by Roy H. Hoopes, Jr.

BOOKS AND COMMENT 16

Runaway Soviet Literary Revolt?
by George Gibian

Reviews: The Brave Coward; Some Must Watch; The Problem of Knowledge; A Citizen Looks at Congress

ART 22

VOL. 136, NO. 16, ISSUE 2212

Correspondence

► *The Aims of Education*

SIRS:

MY thirty years' experience in the public schools makes me painfully aware of our shortcomings, but more than ever convinced that the schools are on the right track, and that essentially they are doing a good job. With other teachers, I welcomed Dr. Bestor's original attack on the Life Adjustment program, (*NR*, March 4) which I believe is an effort of business interests to get a cheap labor supply of teenagers, since the ultimate aim is to develop a work-study plan on the high school level, cutting short the time of formal high school education from three to two or two-and-one-half years. This program is not a product of educators, but was sponsored by the US Office of Education which seems at the time to have been

(*Continued on page 23*)

More Punch Per Pound?

IN THE pre-atomic past, greatness in the world of power politics was determined by a nation's capacity to prepare for any sort of war against any sort of enemy. Today, the cost and destructiveness of the new weapons compel even the most powerful nations to choose between types of defense. And in its 1957 White Paper on defense policy, Great Britain has chosen: reliance on nuclear deterrence. Thereby, Britain hopes to save money and manpower, both of which are in short supply, for, as President Eisenhower explained this month, Britain

> has had a really heroic row to hoe in trying to keep its economic nose above water. . . . So what they are trying to do is to cut their cloth, you might say, according to what they had, and not to what they would like to have.

The White Paper clearly and candidly reverses a policy laid down two years ago by Sir Winston Churchill, who on March 1, 1955, told the House of Commons that,

> Unless we were prepared to unleash a full-scale nuclear war as soon as some local incident occurs in some distant country, we must have conventional forces in readiness to deal with such situations as they arise. Though world war may be prevented by the deterrent power of nuclear weapons, the Communists may well resort to military action in furtherance of their policy of infiltration and encroachment in many parts of the world. There may well be limited wars on the Korea model, with limited objectives. We must be able to play our part in these. . . .

That part can no longer be played by Britain. Suez was the last act. Henceforth, the British—like ourselves—will invest most heavily in the kind of weapons needed to fight the war that is least likely to occur (a total one directly involving the US and the Soviet Union), while sharply reducing the capacity for fighting the most likely war (a limited one, on the pattern of Korea).

But the fact that the British have bought the Eisenhower-Dulles-Wilson doctrine of "massive retaliation" does not confirm its correctness. To illustrate, the White Paper admits that what keeps Soviet military ambitions in check is mainly the American Strategic Air Command, and that Britain could not hope to defend herself if that deterrent failed. It then goes on to say, however, that Britain must produce her own H-Bombs, although there is no conceivable situation in which she could make independent use of them—unless one assumes that we would not intervene in the event of a threatened Russian thermonuclear attack on the British Isles. And that is a fanciful assumption; we have already agreed to supply Britain with missiles which could drop H-Bombs on Moscow and Leningrad.

But, British spokesmen argue, unless Britain has an independent element of thermonuclear strength, she will lose whatever independence of action

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she still has. Independence, one wonders, to do what? Britain needs least of all independence of America in deterring Russia from starting a global war. The area where she might well need independence is that where local or limited wars might break out—areas where our two countries do not have the same interests and obligations, as they appeared not to have in Cyprus or Egypt. But it is precisely in this area that the White Paper, by making heavy cuts in conventional forces, sacrifices the possibility of independence. By so doing, Britain has cast off her last chance of developing an independent Commonwealth defense policy.

FOR WHAT practical contingencies does the Western shift away from non-nuclear defense prepare us? By what Sir Winston described as "a process of sublime irony," safety *has* become "the sturdy child of terror and survival the twin brother of annihilation." The destructiveness of nuclear weapons—in their immediate impact and their secondary fall-out effects—makes it as certain as anything can be that no power will deliberately initiate a world war. The clear and present danger for the West, as has been emphasized often in these pages, is the danger of local aggression spreading to global war (or being permitted to succeed), because the West has no convincing means of limiting its military response. The logic of relying solely or primarily on nuclear retaliation leads ultimately to denying ourselves any alternatives but suicide or appeasement.

The unwritten assumption behind the new British defense program is that the bare threat of nuclear retaliation will be sufficient to prevent aggression. But how persuasive is this, since the White Paper honestly admits that it would be fatal for Britain to implement that threat? The fallacies in this assumption become many times more dangerous if other members of the Western alliance are led to base their defense on it as well, thus setting off a chain reaction throughout NATO which will not only heighten Russian fears (and perhaps transform them into dangerous panic), but which will diminish still further the chance of limiting any future war. Has not Chancellor Adenauer, after insisting for months on the need for a powerful conventional defense force which could extinguish frontier fires without plunging the world into a holocaust, now staked the German claim to atomic weapons? His Defense Minister has made it plain that Germany expects to receive them soon.

We have never suggested and do not now suggest that the US should "trust" the Russians and unilaterally stop all production of atomic weapons. Our point is that if the abyss does lie at the end of the path we are travelling —and it well may—one would expect that a policy which equates national security with H-Bombs and rockets equipped with atomic warheads would be more widely and seriously discussed. There is almost no discussion—in or out of Congress. The sense of terrible urgency over radiation hazards, or over the danger that dependence on nuclear deterrence may deprive us of effective influence in instances of limited aggression, or over the possibility that someone may stumble over our atomic "tripwire" in Europe and through miscalculation set off total war—these anxieties do not animate our diplomacy.

No proposal since Mr. Eisenhower's "open sky" plan of two years ago—and that involved little risk at all for us—has had the needed note of diplomatic boldness. Our criticism is not that the Administration has risked so much on nuclear deterrence, but that it has risked so little elsewhere.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
1244 NINETEENTH ST. N.W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

GILBERT A. HARRISON, *Editor and Publisher*
MICHAEL STRAIGHT, *Editor-at-Large*
HELEN FULLER, *Managing Editor*
Selig S. Harrison, *Associate Editor*
Donald Malcolm, *Staff Writer* Irvin Shapiro, *Design*
Lucille Davis, *Copy Asst.* F. R. Ruskin, *Admin. Asst.*
Robert Evett, *Book and Music Editor*

Published weekly and Copyrighted, 1957 in the USA by The New Republic, Inc., and distributed to newsstands by the Eastern News Company, N. Y. 14, N. Y. Phone: REpublic 7-8656. Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1950, at the post office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Single copy, 25c; Yearly subscription, $7.00; Foreign, $8.00; Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Please include both old and new addresses.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Washing of Hands

THE LATE E. Herbert Norman was one of a vanishing breed—the scholar-diplomat. As a Harvard graduate student in the 'thirties, during the very period of his probable association with Communists in a Marxist study group, Norman wrote his classic *Japan's Emergence As A Modern State*. It was the first of a series of respected writings which he undertook during his diplomatic career.

That career might soon have taken him to Communist China as Canada's first Ambassador. And therein lies another clue to the determination of some in this country to destroy him. Canada has long been waiting for the proper moment to recognize Communist China, one when the least damage would be done to US-Canadian relations. Only one name other than Norman's had even been mentioned for this post. To discredit Norman now was to discredit in advance any change in Canada's China policy.

Let us leave aside the personal tragedy of Norman's suicide (if one can do that as blithely as those who helped drive him to it). What justification can anyone advance for the behavior of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee? Assume the worst: that our intelligence services were convinced that the Canadian Government is blind, that Norman not only was a Communist 20 years ago (which Canadian Foreign Secretary Lester Pearson implies may be true), but that at the time of his death in Cairo, Ambassador Norman was in touch with the Communist conspiracy (which Mr. Pearson categorically refutes). Surely then, the only proper remedy for the US would have been to convey its information through diplomatic channels to Canadian authorities. Or, should the Canadians prefer to trust *their* intelligence, to have privately instructed US representatives to withhold from Norman all sensitive information.

But this proper course of action assumes that our foreign relations are the responsibility of the President and his Secretary of State—a thoroughly constitutional assumption but one that is denied again and again by the President. "They [the Canadians]," said Mr. Eisenhower, "know what are the privileges and rights of our legislative branch in conducting investigations and making public their findings." The Canadians know nothing of the sort. Nor do we. It is neither the privilege nor the right of Congress publicly to investigate the political views of an Ambassador of a foreign power to a foreign country. The President's cowardly evasion was received, at least by the Toronto *Globe and Mail*, with "a mixture of incredulity and disgust."

One wonders whether the President will stand aside again should the Senate Subcommittee now make good its threat to "get" Lester Pearson—with Elizabeth Bentley on the witness stand?

FROM THE

Congressional Record

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 1957

Inflationary Danger

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, the older Members of the Congress will remember Roy G. Fitzgerald who represented the Dayton, Ohio, district for many years. He was a very capable lawyer and a very capable writer. In other words, he was a poet. He has been out of Congress for several years and is now back in his native Dayton where he ranks at the top of the list of lawyers. But, he is still a poet.

Mr. Fitzgerald sent me a little poem entitled "Inflation Must Stop," which is very entrancing and reads as follows:

. . . When currency we trust in, has lost all
purchase power
There'll be no place of refuge; no ark, no
ivory tower.
With suicide on suicide, we'll face the
countless dead
When people come to realize their savings
all have fled.
Insurance, bonds, and pensions are worthless
as the dust
And thousands then in horror will face
starvation's thrust.
No Communistic Russia's as dangerous as this
threat
That our beloved country'll fall from its
parapet.
The tocsin now is sounding, but shall
we heed its call?
Shall we reject the warning and let the
nation fall?

ROY G. FITZGERALD

You can see from this little poem that our friend and former colleague still has an active mind and knows what is going on. We send him our best wishes.

Jordan Barometer

DISMISSAL of Jordan's pro-Russian, pro-Egyptian Prime Minister by the boy king Hussein raises the old question: What does our government hope for in the Middle East? An unstated premise of the Eisenhower Doctrine is that American aid and American diplomacy can pry Arab governments loose from Russia and possibly drive a wedge between Egyptian President Nasser and his Arab League partners. But if this strategy succeeds, what kind of regional groupings would emerge?

After President Eisenhower's roving salesman for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Doctrine, Mr. James Richards, had made most of his stops in the Middle East, he had dispensed more than $100 million in arms and economic grants. But not a hint emerged of any political gain for the West. The only tangible quid was the five-year renewal of the Dhahran air base in Saudi Arabia, an agreement actually consummated in Washington before Mr. Richard's trip began.

Clearly an about-face such as occurred in Iran some three years ago is unlikely to be repeated. Within a few months, it will be recalled, Iran ousted its extremist leader Mossadegh, restored the Shah, arranged compensation for British oil interests, and joined the Baghdad Pact. From tolerance of local Communists, it switched 180 degrees to membership in the anti-Communist coalition. Such a reversal is unlikely in any of the Arab states abutting Israel. There is no sign of a decline in nationalist fervor in any Arab country. There is no lessening of anti-Israeli sentiment. There is no drop in Nasser's popularity among Arab crowds, army staffs and civil servants.

But there is this change: a feeling that Nasser has permitted Russian influence to go too far, a view shared by some leaders in Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Iraq. This is the one new prospect which gives great significance to events in Jordan.

The kingdom of Jordan is the only independent country in the world which has never fed or supported itself. A quarter of its food is imported. A third of its population of 1.5 million are on the UN dole as Palestinian refugees. Established in 1946, the kingdom lived 11 years on an annual British subsidy, now counts on promised subsidies from Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia. If Jordan opts for a foreign policy independent of Egypt and moves closer to its neighbors who are wary of Nasser —Lebanon, Iraq and Saudi Arabia—this could be the beginning of the pattern which the West is seeking.

THE RELUCTANT VICE PRESIDENT

THE LEAD editorial in last week's *New Republic* stresses the need for clarifying what happens in the event the President becomes so incapacitated that he cannot fulfill the duties of his office. In so doing the editorial questions the necessity of amending the Constitution to take care of this contingency. The point is made that there is virtually no chance of obtaining the two-thirds majority required to get such an amendment through Congress.

The editorial then goes on to ask whether the problem could not be solved simply by

> making explicit what is now implicit in the Constitution, clarifying the inherent right of the Vice President to assume the powers and duties of the Presidency should Presidential disability require that assumption?

"Simplicity," the editorial says, "and the centering of responsibility on one person seem to us the better part of political wisdom."

The Vice President is, I grant, under a constitutional mandate to assume the responsibilities of executive power under certain circumstances. He automatically takes office as Chief Executive upon the death or resignation of the President, or his removal from office. Perhaps he is the most obvious "fact-finding" agent in such a case. Furthermore, no one will dispute the fact that the Vice President holds the most important elective office in our government next to the President himself, being the only other official elected by the people of the entire nation. Those favoring the Vice President's taking the initiative maintain that he is in at least as good a position as any other individual, or group, to make what might well be a difficult decision.

However, it seems to me that to expect a Vice President himself to act is to ask too much of human nature. A Vice President having such power might find himself in an extremely awkward position. If he makes the initial determination of inability, he opens himself up to the charge of being overly ambitious, if not a usurper. Such authority, unquestionably, could in fact lead to a usurpation of Presidential power by a Vice President. Two former members of Congress who were particularly interested in the problem of Presidential inability—Sens. George F. Hoar of Massachusetts and Charles W. Jones of Florida—are among those who have declared it would be dangerous to vest the power of determination in the Vice President.

Now, it has been claimed that the danger of usurpation could be guarded against by Congress' power of impeachment. The impeachment power, however, has been used only once in our history and is not an easy weapon to use against an unduly ambitious Vice President.

To date, of course, the problem has been the reluctance of Vice Presidents to act rather than excessive ambition on their part. However, if the danger of usurpation on the pretext of inability is slight, the danger that a Vice President will fail to assume the duties and powers of the Presidency in cases of real Presidential disability is great. Former Vice Presidents Barkley and Wallace have been reported as saying recently that they would not have attempted to make the crucial decision themselves had a situation arisen requiring such a determination.

Most Vice Presidents would have a natural reluctance to open themselves to the charge that by making a deter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mination of inability they were seeking to advance their own political futures.

The New Republic editorial takes note of this fact but argues that a joint Congressional resolution authorizing the Vice President to act could appreciably modify such reluctance. It seems to me, however, that more than a joint resolution would be needed to assure the Vice President of public support for his action.

IT must be remembered, too, that under the system for electing Vice Presidential nominees which has customarily been used by national nominating conventions there is no assurance that the person selected will enjoy a good working relationship with the nominee for President, or even be in sympathy with his views. Increasingly, of late, demands are heard that political parties select their Vice Presidential candidates on the basis of sympathy with the philosophy and policies of their Presidential running mates. Traditionally, however, despite the fact that one-fourth of our Presidents have died in office and been succeeded by the Vice President, other factors have been foremost. These have included such considerations as the desirability of obtaining geographical balance on a ticket, the necessity for placating a party faction which failed to put over its choice for the Presidential nomination, and the wish to grant some measure of solace to a man who sought, but failed to obtain, the top spot on the ticket. Thus we have had such winning combinations as Garfield and Arthur, Wilson and Marshall, Lincoln and Johnson, Coolidge and Dawes, McKinley and Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt and Garner.

Although lack of accord between the nation's two top officials might conceivably lead to an attempt by the one to succeed the other under circumstances of doubtful validity, it is more likely to increase the reluctance of the Vice President when the need actually arises to assume the duties and powers of an incumbent President with whom he has not been closely identified. Indeed, this factor was said to have been an important consideration in the decision of Vice President Arthur to refuse to accede to requests that he assume these obligations during the incapacity of President Garfield. Arthur was a "stalwart," selected as a Vice Presidential candidate to pacify Roscoe Conkling and his allies in the face of the selection of Garfield, a "half-breed," for the Presidential nomination. Accordingly, he feared that any action on his part to assume the duties and powers of the Presidency during Garfield's incapacity would be misinterpreted as an attempt to seize power.

Earlier I mentioned that Congress' power to impeach has been cited as a deterrent to an overly ambitious Vice President. Yet existence of the power might also serve to make a Vice President excessively cautious. If he alone were to determine questions of Presidential inability he might, in effect, be gambling his political future upon the likelihood of impeachment proceedings. If such proceedings were initiated his future would rest on their outcome. It is likely that he would be as cautious as Vice Presidents Arthur and Marshall in the Garfield and Wilson cases. If such were the result, of course, the proposal to have the Vice President make the determination would not solve the problem. We should be back where we started. What we are seeking is a safe and effective means for having disability determined.

Furthermore, specific authorization for action by the Vice President would not resolve the conflict which is likely to result between the Vice President and the President's close associates in cases where the latter wish to hide or minimize a President's disability. Should such a conflict occur, a Vice President might well feel that to further his own political ends it might be wise for him to defer to the President's official family or lieutenants. This would be especially true if he felt that the President, upon recovery, might support the view of his own entourage as against the Vice President.

All the inability proposals thus far suggested have certain weaknesses. *The New Republic* editorial makes the point that there is no "consensus on what constitutional change is best." I would go further. I would say there is no consensus in Congress as to what is the best solution, be it by constitutional amendment, simple resolution or joint resolution.

WHAT then, should be done? Will the whole question once more be left up in the air, as it was after brief flurries of interest following the Garfield and Wilson cases?

It could prove disastrous to drop the matter now. We live in an uneasy peace—a peace maintained at least in part by the "balance of terror" of atomic bombs and guided missiles. Presidential disability today, accompanied by indecision, confusion and lack of leadership, could result in extremely serious international problems, if not war itself. No longer can we hope to "muddle through," on the theory that the present system has worked all right for 168 years. In today's world even a few hours with no one administering the powers of the Presidency could prove crucial.

Obviously the whole problem requires more study. I believe a Presidential Inability Commission should be established to study the various proposals which have been advanced and to make recommendations to Congress and the President. In addition to carrying on its studies, such a commission could help to keep alive public interest in this vital and perplexing problem.

PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., M.C.

Washington, D. C.

MR. FRELINGHUYSEN *(Rep.) is a third-term Representative from the 5th District in New Jersey.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEXAS' NEW JUNIOR SENATOR

RALPH YARBOROUGH is a very tough Texan. For five years all the forces of Texas conservatism—money, respectability, the newspapers—tried to knock him out. He ran for governor three times, he lost three times, but he survived to become the junior Senator from Texas. Though he won with a 38 percent plurality, not a majority, Yarborough's was a phenomenal triumph in a contest among 19 candidates. The question now is: what will his triumph mean for the country?

The sanguine view here is that he will join the Fulbright-Sparkman-Hill-Kefauver band of Southerners. Compared with most Texans elected in recent years to high office, Yarborough's a radical, which is to say that what he really is is a moderate Democrat. He is against "forced integration." (Just what this will mean in this session's civil-rights fight is yet to be seen; Yarborough carried the Negro precincts in the cities overwhelmingly, and he will have to think of that.) Like every other Texas politician in Washington, he is committed to defend the oil industry's 27.5 percent tax windfall, and he opposes federal regulation of gas prices. Finally, he is for "trimming the fat out of foreign aid," and during his Senate campaign he lambasted the Administration for its $200 million grant to Ibn Saud, who, he said, rushed right out and bought "80 jeweled, gold-plated Cadillacs." Which is a good many—even in Texas. In this bizarre context he endorsed "drastic cuts" in foreign aid, about which most of his backers hope he was kidding.

Yarborough

Otherwise, he is an orthodox national Democrat. He predicts he will be voting with the Democrats more than 90 percent of the time. He is for more rural electrification, federal subsidies for farm to market roads, 90 percent of parity for farmers, lower interest rates in general, higher postal salaries, federal aid for dams, roads, and probably schools, the Democrats' public housing program, effective limits on campaign spending, fewer government contracts for General Motors and more for small business and a personal income tax exemption of $800 instead of $600 ("Let human beings that breathe and have souls get some of those tax cuts"). He campaigned for Adlai Stevenson after his own defeats in 1952 and 1956, allowing that he generally finds himself

> in agreement with the Democratic Party and the theory that government ought to serve the people instead of the Republican theory of more profits for big business regardless of the welfare of the people as a whole.

Will Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn "control" him? Neither endorsed him for the Senate, though they may have favored him, recognizing that he was *the* Democrat the Republicans and the "Eisenhower Democrats" had to beat. There is no reason to think that Lyndon Johnson will not put himself out to be friendly. And yet, the fact is that Texas liberals no longer like or trust Johnson. The Senate Majority Leader, with Rayburn assenting, lost their support at last year's state presidential convention in Texas when he kept Mrs. R. D. Randolph, their chosen Democratic National Committeewoman and their most dramatic leader, sitting in a cow barn with the legal Houston delegation all day while he, ex-Gov. Allan Shivers, and Governor-elect Price Daniel baldly stole the convention majority from them. The people whom Lyndon, Sam and their colleagues of the moment deprived of their control of the state party are the same people who elected Yarborough—the urban liberals, union workers and the rural brass-collars. Mrs. Randolph, in fact, led normally conservative Houston into the Yarborough camp in his last two elections, an incredible feat of organization and devotion. Facing a campaign next summer for re-election to a full 6-year term (which he will have a good chance of winning), Yarborough cannot now turn on the main body of his backers, even if he would. Thus, when a Texas reporter asked him bluntly, after his election, if he would co-operate with Johnson, he replied, after a pause, "I will co-operate with the Democratic Party."

THOSE in Texas who supported FDR through the New Deal, stood by Harry Truman in the 1948 campaign, howled in anger as the "Eisenhower Democrats" took over the state party in 1952, and moved back into their own house in 1956—have been on a prolonged binge since Yarborough's victory. At one post-election party toward 4 a.m., a Yarborough backer who had seen him, and the liberals, go down again and again in the state elections thought back to the reign of New Dealing Governor Jimmy Allred in 1936 and said to anyone who would listen, "It's been a long, long time." A Humble Oil lobbyist who visited the riotous Yarborough headquarters election night found it all very curious, "No big shots there, just people," he said. It was something entirely new to him, and to postwar Texas.

RONNIE DUGGER

Austin, Texas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Superficial Aspect

Bring Me My Mail!

THESE LINES were written on a day when the postman deposited 10 envelopes at my door. Two contained letters bringing me needed information. Eight were third-class mail, that is to say, advertising of one kind or another. Eight went into the waste-basket unopened, but that doesn't mean that I escaped unscathed. Somebody has to empty the waste-basket, and I have to search through loads of junk that the postman brings in order to find my letters. There is always danger that, deceived by outward appearance, I may throw away a letter.

For this reason, Mr. Arthur Summerfield's threat not to accept any more third-class mail drew me, emotionally, to the Postmaster General's side in his head-on collision with Congress. It was strictly an emotional reaction. Intellectually, I do not think his case a good one. Mr. Summerfield is not hired to conduct a profit-making enterprise; he is hired to keep the mails moving, and if he can't do it he should get the hell out and let somebody take over who can do it. Nevertheless, the merest hint that the transportation of junk mail might be stopped is so inspiring that one is inclined to forgive the hinter almost anything.

For the rest, a superficial observer must regard this battle with a languid interest, tinged with melancholy. Whoever wins, the superficial observer is going to lose, if not as a customer of the post office, then as a taxpayer, probably as both. There is a better than fair prospect that Congress will knuckle under and give the Postmaster General the $47 million extra that he demands; wherein the taxpayers will lose. And it is a moral certainty that the United States mails will continue to be the slowest, least adequate and most expensive postal service in the civilized world; wherein the customers will lose.

When Benjamin Franklin was Postmaster General he accepted the theory that the purpose of his organization was to transmit information as rapidly as possible and as inexpensively as possible. Profit was not an object; speed was the first consideration, and low cost the second, which is to say, the convenience of the public took precedence over everything else.

But that was before the United States was organized as a nation, and Franklin's idea was outmoded long ago. The Postmaster General soon came to be regarded as Politician-in-Chief to the Administration and he continued to play that role down to the regime of James A. Farley. Truman was the President who broke the succession; seeing the need of becoming his own Politician-in-Chief he put the professional mail-handler, Donaldson, at the head of the department.

Eisenhower has not resumed the old practice, nor has he gone back to Franklin's idea. For the old Politician-in-Chief he has substituted the staff system, including Brownell, Nixon and Adams. But neither is the Postmaster General a professional. He seems to be, rather, the ambassador of Madison Avenue to the court of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I pick up three letters received within the last week and examine the postmarks. One reads, "At Easter Help Crippled Children." Another reads, "Strike Back at Cancer—Give—American Cancer Society." The third reads, "Give—Red Cross Fund."

I cherish no animus against crippled children or the Red Cross, and I am definitely opposed to cancer. All these appeals are praiseworthy; but the business of the post office is to bring me my mail, not to support worthy causes. The postmark originally served two purposes—to cancel the stamp, thereby serving the government, and to inform me of the origin of my letters, thereby serving me. Why should worthy causes be allowed to horn in?

IN the philosophy of Madison Avenue there should be no blank space left without an advertising sign. Even if no money is to be gained, it is better to put up a sign free than to leave any blank space; and above the address an envelope shows a blank space. As a matter of fact, privately-leased cancelling machines are permitted to carry commercial advertising. Under no circumstances must the American eye be left empty of some kind of admonition, even if it is only an admonition to do good.

All of which fits in with the theory that it is the function of the public servant, not to serve, but to manipulate the public. In the current clash between Congress and the Postmaster General, service of the public has been lost to sight; the object of both contestants is so to manipulate public opinion as to bring pressure to bear on the other. If the customer's interest and convenience are trampled in the process, what of it? The customer is a half-witted child, whose mental processes must be manipulated by the wise copy-writers of Madison Avenue.

Well, aren't they more or less right? If the American people are so abject that they will stand for this treatment, it would seem unreasonable to object when they get what they asked for at the polls in 1956.

GERALD W. JOHNSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Mr. Eisenhower was asked recently to comment on Japan's desire to trade with Communist China, his elliptical answer boiled down to this: We don't like aid to Japan. We don't like Japanese imports in the US. We don't like the Japanese trading with China. But if we must yield on something, it will be on China trade.

Pressure from our allies, including Japan, is not the only or even the principal reason for our government's reassessment of the China trade boycott, a carryover from Korean War days. Recent Western intelligence reports indicate that the boycott has not deprived China of significant amounts of machinery for her five-year plan. And the respected journalist, Edmund Stevens of Look *magazine, has said that "thus far, policies aimed at ostracizing and blockading China have, without undermining the regime, forced it to rely almost exclusively on the Soviet Union."*

The China embargo policy has, in fact, sprung so many leaks it cannot long stay afloat. Some of the reasons why this is so, and why China trade is an enticing prospect, are set forth in the following article by a visitor to Japan.

Japan and China

by SHAO CHUAN LENG

WHAT I am attempting to do here is present a composite interview with Japanese intellectuals, whose influence in Japan at this moment is great, far greater than their numerical strength would suggest. My report is not intended as a debate, but as a study—based on personal talks and an examination of their writings and lectures—of how the "eggheads" of Japan think about world affairs and why they are so attracted by the idea of an "independent" foreign policy.

Question: When you speak of an "independent" diplomacy, do you mean Japan should follow a Nehru type of neutralism in international politics?

Answer: We mean Japan should abandon her "America-first" diplomacy and cease to be "subservient" to the United States. We should have a foreign policy of our own and not follow anybody else's. Of course, it is natural for Japan to seek close relations with countries in the Afro-Asian group so we shall not remain as "the orphan of Asia."

Q: There is talk about anti-Americanism in Japan. For example, last year Waseda University students demonstrated against the arrival of American professors and at Sunawaka there was a violent demonstration against the expansion of the US Air Force base. Do you go along with this?

A: The Waseda affair was merely a misguided behavior on the part of some immature students. The Sunakawa case, however, was a genuine expression of our opposition to the expansion of American bases. But it should not be confused with anti-Americanism. There is a natural resentment in Japan against a former occupation power and against America's "paternalistic complex." But we do not hate Americans. Anti-Americanism as such does not exist.

SHAO CHUAN LENG, *a member of the Foreign Affairs Faculty of the University of Virginia, is currently at work on a book on* Japan's Relations with Communist China *at Doshisha University in Kyoto.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Q: How exactly do you propose to adjust present Japanese-American relations?

A: Negotiate for the abolition of the Japan-US Security Pact and for the withdrawal of American forces from Japanese soil. For one thing, in the atomic age the stationing of American forces will not protect Japan but only expose her to the grave danger of being the first victim of a nuclear war. For another, Japan has to assert herself as a self-respecting and free country if she is expected to assume the role of the champion of democracy in Asia. Furthermore, the presence of American forces in Japan cannot avoid some unfortunate incidents, like the recent shooting of a Japanese woman at Somagahara. These arouse ill feelings and cause frictions between our two countries.

Q: But are you prepared to shoulder more of the defense burden yourself? Are you going to expand your present Self-Defense Forces of 180,000 men and to increase your defense expenditures which constitute 13 percent of the total national budget?

A: No. Japan should find her security in the protection of the UN rather than in rearmament. Rearmament is politically unconstitutional and economically unbearable for us. We should reduce our security forces to a minimum, just enough to maintain internal peace and order. We do not want to see our country become a military base for anybody, including ourselves. In fact, as the first nation with a specific constitutional provision renouncing the right to war and rearmament, Japan should use her unique moral position to champion world disarmament in the United Nations.

Q: But suppose the UN could not protect your security, as it could not in the case of Hungary, what then?

A: In that case there would be a third world war and the US would come to our rescue anyway. But such an eventuality is very remote if we pursue an "independent" peace diplomacy. Let me say a word about Hungary. Much as we deplore the Russian intervention in that country, we cannot help feeling that the Hungarian tragedy, viewed in a broad perspective, was caused by the conflict between the East and the West between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. This is why we are all the more determined that Japan should get out of her present entanglement as soon as she can.

Q: In view of Russia's action in Hungary and her past dealings with Japan, have you not welcomed the recent resumption of diplomatic relations between your country and the Soviet Union with some misgivings?

A: Misgivings or not, the normalization of Japan-USSR relations is necessary. I do not deny that there are some unsolved problems—the territorial issue is one—and that there are some people who feel uneasy about possible Communist infiltration. But on the whole we find more positive gains in the restoration of ties between the two countries. It should undoubtedly serve to relax tension and contribute to peace and stability in the Far East. It also has opened the way for Japan to regain her diplomatic initiative in normalizing relations with other Communist countries and thereby elevate her position in the international arena. Since the resumption of Soviet ties, Japan has been admitted into the United Nations and has been received by the Afro-Asian group in a new way. Our next logical step will be to normalize relations with Communist China.

Q: There seems to be a stronger sentiment in Japan for a rapprochement with Communist China than with Russia or any other Communist country. Public opinion surveys show that the majority of the Japanese favor the restoration of some form of rapprochement with the mainland. How do you explain this attitude?

A: I would attribute it to such factors as (1) geographical proximity, (2) historical and cultural ties, (3) economic considerations, and (4) recognition of the accomplishments of Communist China.

Q: Is it wrong to assume that you may also have a "guilty conscience" in your attitude toward China? Do you not feel compelled to do something to make up for what your militarists have done to the Chinese?

A: Let me put it this way. Historically, close relations of long standing have existed between China and Japan. Indeed, our civilization owes much to the Chinese. But in the recent past, Sino-Japanese relations have been marked by wars and unfortunate incidents. Be that as it may, our feeling now is that we should make determined efforts to remove the unhappy memory of the recent past and to restore our traditional friendship with the Chinese people. The Peking Government is moving in that direction, too, as evidenced by its handling of the repatriation of Japanese civilians and war prisoners.

Q: According to press reports, the Japanese topped the list of foreign visitors touring Communist China last year. There are also many books and articles written in Japan that are full of laudatory comments on the "achievements of the new China." Does all this indicate that you are genuinely impressed by Communist China?

A: Yes. From all the evidence available, we cannot but be impressed by the ability of the Chinese Communist Government to clean up corruption, achieve political stability, and push forward the programs of agricultural co-operation and industrialization. We intellectuals in particular have a theoretical interest in the Chinese revolution as a new and realistic road to socialism. This, however, does not mean that we want Japan to travel China's road, just as we do not want our country to be a follower of the United States.

Q: One of the loudest demands you have been voicing is for trade expansion with Communist China and the end of the embargo against the mainland. To what extent have Western restrictions on trade with China handicapped you?

A: We have been seriously handicapped. In prewar years (1930-1939) we sold nearly 22 percent of our

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exports to China and bought more than 12 percent of our imports from the Chinese. In 1952, however, out of our total trade, exports to China were only .04 percent and imports .7 percent. Even in 1955 it amounted only to 1.4 percent and 3.2 percent respectively of our total exports and imports. Although we concluded three private trade agreements with China (1952, 1953, 1955), none of them were fulfilled because of the embargo regulations imposed by the West.

Q: But I understand the restrictions have been gradually eased, and as a result your exports to the mainland during 1956 increased to $67,322,000—more than a 100-percent boost over the previous year.

A: This increase, nevertheless, is still far below both the prewar level and the potentialities of the China market. Several years having passed since the Korean armistice, the continuation of a strict embargo policy against China does not make much sense either to us or to America's allies in Europe.

Q: There are arguments among your own countrymen that even if restrictions on China trade are removed, Japan cannot expect to expand her China trade to any sizable proportions, since 80 percent of Communist China's trade today is carried on with the Soviet bloc. Furthermore, does not Japan have to consider the greater importance of her economic ties with America? In 1955 exports to the US amounted to $449 million or 22.3 percent of your total exports, and imports from the US came to $772 million or 31.2 percent of the total imports. This trade is reported to have increased further in 1956. Besides, American military spending in Japan has been considerable and it alone accounted for $500 million last year. How do you answer this?

A: First, let me remind you that there are definite limits to China's trade with the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union and Eastern European countries cannot supply everything China needs for her industrialization. What is more, China must gradually minimize her dependence on the Soviets if she wants to assert her leadership in Asia. Consequently, she is bound to seek more trade with Japan in the future. As to our economic relations with America, we are quite mindful of their importance. We would like to expand our US trade, particularly exports.

On the other hand, we do not want to put all our eggs in one basket. Japan cannot achieve political independence if she is too dependent upon America economically. An expanded trade with Communist China will enable us to buy cheaper iron and coal from the continent than from the US. It also can help make up for the loss of special procurement orders when American forces are withdrawn.

Q: Whatever you may do, is it possible for you to restore your old trade relations with the China continent? Before the war the trade was based on a semi-colonial relationship, with China serving chiefly as a supplier of raw materials and a market for Japan's consumer goods. In view of changed conditions in China, don't you think this is completely out of the question today?

A: Yes, I agree that the prewar trade pattern can never be restored. In fact, a new pattern based on mutual interests is now emerging. The composition of our current major exports to China (chemicals, fertilizers, light machinery, and cement) points to this change. Future Sino-Japanese trade will be closely linked to China's economic construction. To implement their five-year plans, the Chinese will welcome capital goods and technical assistance from Japan; at the same time the development of China's economic productivity will make it possible for her to sell us materials we need. As the purchasing power of the Chinese people increases, there will be a new demand for our consumer goods, too.

Q: So much, however, depends on the success of Communist China's economic construction, her willingness to buy more from a politically not-too-reliable source, and her ability to sell to you such materials as coal and iron she needs for her own industrialization. Also, what about Western Europe's competition for the China market and the possibility that China, after her successful industrialization, may become a strong commercial rival of Japan in Southeast Asia?

A: We know the limitations and vulnerability of trade with Communist China. But how can we ignore a big country with 600 million potential customers? After all, Japan depends on trade for survival, and yet our goods are still being discriminated against by some Western countries, including the US. Under the circumstances we have no choice but to exploit all the opportunities we can find. Call it wishful thinking if you like, the China market possesses a great potentiality, and we feel Japan should make the most of it.

Q: What would be the political implications of your closer economic ties with Communist China? Would they expose Japan to the danger of communization as feared by some people?

A: No, they would not. We shall remain as a democratic nation and separate trade from politics. Of course, no full scale Sino-Japanese trade can ever be developed without a relaxation of the embargo and normalization of our ties with China. This inevitably leads to the problem of Formosa, and relations between Communist China and the United States.

Q: Do you have any suggestion to solve these problems?

A: I don't have anything specific. Theoretically, the problem of Formosa is a Chinese internal matter, but we would like to see the issue solved peacefully through negotiations between Washington and Peking. Knowing both sides equally well, Japan is in a unique position to mediate between the US and Communist China for a general Far Eastern settlement. However, before we can become a bridge between the East and the West, we must first assert our complete independence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whodunit?

If Congress Is Going to Search History for Villains Why Not Ask the Help of Some Scholars?

by **ERNEST R. MAY**

OFF AND ON in recent years Congress has celebrated the Cherry Blossom festival by holding an investigating carnival. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1949, for instance, pilloried the Institute of Pacific Relations. The theme for 1951 was the firing of General MacArthur, re-enacted before the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services. In 1954 Senator McCarthy wrestled the army two falls out of three. This year, later this month, there is to be an inquest by a Foreign Relations Subcommittee into United States diplomacy in the Middle East.

Though started as an investigation of Secretary Dulles, it promises to be much grander. Republicans have insisted that it sweep back to 1946, and the result may well be another massive assault on history, comparable to the Pearl Harbor hearings of 1946.

Whether history ought to be investigated by such a body is a moot question. It has happened, is obviously about to happen again, and will probably continue. So long as this is the case, both Congress and the public might well give some thought to improving legislative methods of historical research.

While the usual techniques may serve very well in forcing the executive branch to justify budget requests, they leave much to be desired as a means of getting at the truth of the past. To witness this statement one might recall the Nye Committee, which probed the influence of munitions makers on American intervention in World War I, or, farther back, the Judiciary Committee inquiry of 1919, labelled "Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda." But the better remembered Pearl Harbor and MacArthur inquiries provide enough proof.

In both cases the investigating committees had unique opportunities. Not only were they able to question nearly all the key witnesses, but they had virtually unlimited access to archives. During the MacArthur hearings, as Elmer Davis observed, everyone except the President came to Capitol Hill, stretched out, and bared his thoughts by free association of ideas. The Pentagon helped the committee to rummage through filing cabinets still guarded against spies from the Department of State. Few researchers have ever had such advantages.

Yet the committees made no apparent headway in finding truth. Majority and minority reports contradicted each other, not only in interpretation but in statements of fact. They developed virtually no points of agreement, and their exhaustive inquiries in no way narrowed the public dispute. So far as the public is concerned, the reasons for the Pearl Harbor attack and for General MacArthur's relief remain matters of partisan faith.

If the committees had done a good job of research, of course, their shortcomings in interpretation might be disregarded. But in fact they left more questions unasked than asked. One cannot read even the best account of Pearl Harbor, for example, without becoming painfully aware of issues that the committee might have explored —issues historically far more important than many on which it spent hours and even days.

Take an example from the MacArthur hearings. Any-

ERNEST R. MAY *is Assistant Professor of History at Harvard University.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one who has leafed through Secretary Acheson's testimony will remember how much was made of a speech he had delivered in 1949. Describing the defense perimeter of the US, he had apparently deliberately excluded South Korea. When Republicans questioned him about the speech, they wanted to know only two things: had it not invited the North Korean attack; and had it not, in fact, been ghostwritten by pro-Communists in the Foreign Service? All they sought were statements admitting guilt either for the war or for tolerating subversion. Whenever the Secretary tried to explain why he made the speech, they cut him off. Nor did the majority members help, for they seemed anxious to keep him away from the subject, so that he would not be compelled to reveal political or military calculations that might seem in hindsight to have been recklessly shortsighted. The Secretary was never asked to describe the military situation of 1949, the estimates at that time of Soviet and Chinese capabilities and intentions, or the bearing of allied policies upon his definition of America's defense perimeter. When historians seek these answers, they will have to guess.

THERE ARE understandable reasons, of course, why Senate committees should make such a poor showing in historical research. Investigations of history have no legislative end, and committee members use them, therefore, to gather campaign ammunition. Even when they actually search for the truth, furthermore, they do so as lawyers, believing that truth emerges from a clash bewteen two sides trying to put the best faces on their respective cases. But it ought to be recognized that this procedure does not shed enough light on the past. If committees are going to keep on investigating history, they need to tinker with new methods.

Any number of utopian devices might be suggested, but, as it happens, there is a useful and workable precedent. Just after World War I the Constituent Assembly of the new German Republic conducted a large-scale investigation of the war and the causes for Germany's defeat. Most of its methods were those that the Senate uses. Committees called for documents and testimony. Dealing with explosively controversial issues, the committees divided into highly partisan groups, and much of their interrogation had a criminal court character. But the German committees used an additional device, and largely because of it they were extraordinarily successful. In the 38 years since, indeed, no one has raised a major issue that had not already been painstakingly explored by the committees.

The device was a simple one. Each committee empanelled a body of scholars to help conduct its inquiries. No pretense was made of choosing wholly unbiased men, and some of the scholars were, in fact, as partisan as any committee member. Nor were any special procedures instituted for or by these scholars. They simply sat with the committees, asked questions of witnesses, and requested documents. At the end they joined in more or less partisan groups and prepared reports, just like the factions of the committee itself. Yet they were responsible for the striking success of this work.

The reason for this success was simply that these men, whatever their biases, were scholars. By training, code, and habit, they were questioners. Unlike lawyers, they were accustomed to ask questions even when they had no idea what the answers might be. Unlike legislators, their curiosity exceeded their caution, and they were willing to receive answers that damaged their preconceptions. No matter what each of these German scholars hoped to prove, he asked for explanations. Explanations led to fresh questions, and the result was that the committees ultimately explored the whole intricate pattern of cause and effect and thought and action.

Though the idea of inviting scholars to sit at a committee table may seem outrageous to the custom-bound Senate, it might still be a good idea. The Foreign Relations subcommittee, even at this late date, might invite six or eight distinguished academicians to sit with them. Among the hundreds of possibilities, the subcommittee might begin by sounding out the directors of the University of Chicago's Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy and of the Harvard and Columbia centers for Middle Eastern studies. Even the busiest scholars ought to be willing to serve, and a group could certainly be found that would satisfy both majority and minority.

The benefits might be considerable. At the end of the hearing, for example, the scholars might prepare a narrative setting forth the ascertained facts and the points still in doubt. One need only read an account like the magisterial *Undeclared War, 1940-1941*, by William L. Langer and S. Everett Gleason, to see the amount of certain fact that the Pearl Harbor committee unwittingly collected, or read *The General and the President*, by Richard Rovere and Arthur Schlesinger Jr. to see what another experienced historian was able to make out of the findings of the MacArthur inquiry. If aided by a group of scholars, the Middle East hearings might settle some questions instead of merely refiring partisan views.

Even more important, such a group might help the committee to ask more of the right questions while the hearings were in progress. Like the German scholars, the group might ask for more explanations. It might raise the questions that historians will raise later. It might even uncover enough of the truth to enlighten both the Senate and the Secretary of State.

At any rate, the experiment could cost little in either time or money. If the Middle Eastern inquiry is to follow the pattern of the Pearl Harbor and MacArthur hearings, its duration will not be affected by the number of questioners involved, but merely by the hardiness of the press and the public. And the result might be, conceivably, to transform the inquiry from a pre-election barbecue into a genuine and successful search for truth.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Rich and Flexible Conversation

PERHAPS *you are one of those fact-hungry, eternally curious people for whom* Time *was created. . . . In less than two hours' lively reading a week,* Time *fills you in on everything that matters. . . . Here's the smart way to keep your conversation as current, rich and flexible as the news itself—to command the facts in any kind of situation.*—From an advertisement for *Time,* the weekly news magazine, in the *Atlantic.*

"The question: olive, onion, or twist of lemon peel?" asked eternally curious Luther Martin.

"Answer: a vermouth-absorbing onion," replied fact-hungry John Harris.

"Onion it is," said dapper host Martin, stepping behind his game-room bar.

"Read any good book reviews lately?" asked gray-flanneled Harris, as he pulled up a belt-tall bar stool.

"Yes," replied rich conversationalist Martin, "a column and a half on biased Harvard historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr.'s Book-of-the-Month-Club selection for March, *Crisis of the Old Order.*"

"What did you think of it?" asked news-current conversationalist Harris.

"Well," replied news-smart Martin, pouring another Martini, "perennial child-prodigy Schlesinger handles his history like a man assembling ammunition for a political campaign. His philosophy boils down to the slogan: let government do it. And he clings to the curiously innocent notion that government can run the economic show without eventually controlling the entrances and exits of personal and political freedom."

"Hmm," said lively reader Harris, pushing his vacuum-empty glass forward for another, "it will be interesting to see in 40-year-old boy-wonder Schlesinger Jr.'s later volumes just how much credit Roosevelt's New Deal gets for saving the nation."

"Say when," said fact-commander Martin. "By the way, what do you think of the Middle East situation?"

"Well," said *Time*-inspired conversationalist Harris, "things are looking up since into the vortex of the Israeli crisis last week flew the President, his forehead deeply furrowed, his mood somber. Caught short and piqued by the headlines resulting from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' background press briefing were Republican and Democratic leaders. So they took up positions from which it was difficult to retreat—even in the face of Ike's strong and reasonable arguments."

"You're absholutely right," replied Martin, as he mixed a new batch. "And what really burned me up was the way Secretary Dullesh, appearing fit and fresh in his pin-stripe gray suit and gay red necktie, had to face the hect . . . the hectoring and badgering of a small group of Democrats."

"Furthermore," continued fact-filled-in Harris, pushing his glass forward, "how 'bout that Arkanshaw's J. (for James—or is it John) William Fulbright—who put the stock market into a tailspin by his hazy handling of the 1955 financial hearings—waiting purposely and patiently for his—hic—turn at Dulles, then asking him: Do you really know what you have in mind for Egypt?' "

"Yeah," said martini-soaked Martin, downing a crystal clear Martini, "that Fulbright ish a confushed, head-egged liberal; he wears his sleeve on his Rhodes Scholarship."

"They don't remember," said red-eyed Harris, reaching for the pitcher, "how on the broad chessboard of internashional diplomashy, the US moved decisively last July in a gambit that took the breath of professionals for its daring and won the assent of kibitshers for its instinctive rightness. How in an open show of forsh, Secretary of State John Fosher Dullesh advised Egypt's President Gamal A. (for Abdul) Nashua that the U. Shh. was no longer interested in building the Dam $1.3 billion High Ashwan."

"Shass right," added thick-tongued Luther Martin, upsetting a row of glasses behind the bar as he tried to find the August 13, 1956, issue, "neither does shrill-voiced Wayne (for W.) Morshe remember how lash Augush in one of the mosh unusual gambles in diplomatic hishtory, the Preshident and the Secretary of State proposed to confront Egypt's canal-blocking Preshident Nasher with the pressures of moral law."

LIFTING his head defiantly from the bottle-scarred bar top, word-slurring, blurr-eyed John Harris, still in command of the facts, said: "Dullesh has been training for hish job ever sinshe hish grandfather was Secretary of Shtate, and as Ike shez: 'During these years he acquired a wishdom an' exshperience that I think is posheshed by no man—no other man in the world'."

"Well, fortunately, there's nothin' to worry about," mumbled rapidly-fading host Luther Martin, food-hungry and gin-tranquilized, as he collapsed into an eternally curious pile of magazines behind the bar. " 'The preshent moment is a grave one,' shez a firm, helm-taking Ike, 'but we are certain that moral forsh will prevail in the end'."

ROY H. HOOPES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS & COMMENT

Bridling the Runaway Soviet Literary Revolt

by George Gibian

A NOVEL and a short story, *Not By Bread Alone,* by Vladimir Dudintsev and *Personal Convictions* by D. Granin, were published late last fall in *Novy Mir* (*The New World*), the Soviet magazine which several times in the last few years has got into trouble by printing unorthodox, provocative books and has had its editorial staff frequently reshuffled.

The two works have caused the greatest uproar in literary Russia since the controversy over socialistic realism in 1934. The pages of Soviet papers and magazines have been full of arguments over them; students and the public have been debating them for months. In the normal course of Soviet publication practice, the novel should already have been published in book form, but it has not appeared. The young author is said to be revising the work, a disappointing but not too surprising report.

The novel and the short story are shocking and exciting to the Russian readers because they reverse completely the stereotypes of conventional Soviet literature. To see clearly how the two young writers have infringed the accepted rules, let us try to formulate the four cardinal precepts of the mythology which Soviet writers are supposed to accept: 1. The lone wolf is bad and must be discredited for his antisocial tendencies; the group is hallowed and while it may stray from the right path temporarily, it is vindicated in the end; 2. There is happiness in belonging to the collective; 3. There are no class conflicts, hence all people ought to grow up rather angelic; what villains exist must be atypical "survivals of capitalism," who are "unmasked" and re-educated; 4. There must be strong faith that the general course of development of Soviet society is towards better and higher things; cheerfulness must be the dominant mood.

Such were the old rules of the game; now let us see what the two authors have done to them.

Not By Bread Alone does not merely criticize scattered abuses; it is full of dangerous criticism, daring ideas, and basic departures from the four rules. One protagonist in the novel is Drozdov, the successful Soviet executive, who has worked his way up the ladder until he is the head of an industrial "trust" in a Siberian town. To all intents and purposes he *is* that town. Later he is promoted to an even higher position in a Moscow ministry. His antagonist is Lopatkin, an ex-high school teacher, who has invented a machine for the automatic casting of pipes. Drozdov and a host of other villains behind him are blocking Lopatkin's invention because the vested interests — including a revered Academician and a deputy minister—are backing another, inferior invention. Lopatkin transfers his fight to Moscow. He writes letters, tries to see important people, complains to ministries, to the Party, to newspapers — only to be repulsed time and again by what he calls "Castle Kitezh," the unchanted castle of the "Imperialists," the evil forces, the men in power. Success seems close at hand when the military forces become interested in his invention and authorize him to construct a model, but then his enemies rally and, in a final blow, frame Lopatkin. He is sentenced and sent to Siberia for "betrayal of classified information."

His case is later reviewed, he is released, and does succeed in having his machine accepted (the rival machine having meanwhile proved its inefficiency), but the struggle takes him seven years. In the process of seeking an opportunity to develop his invention, Lopatkin reveals the ruthlessness, even criminality of the Soviet power elite. He also lays bare the viciousness of the entire social system.

The author shows quite explicitly, then, that there *is* a power class structure, and still worse, that the men at the top are corrupt and impede, rather than advance, the progress of Soviet industry and science. The difference from other Soviet works which criticized inertia in the bureaucracy is that the villains in Dudintsev's novel are neither unmasked nor re-educated. They are as firmly entrenched and undisturbed at the end as they had been at the beginning. Lopatkin does succeed in having his invention adopted, but the positions of his enemies remain secure. They covered their tracks effectively—some have even been promoted to higher positions. At the end they shamelessly suggest to Lopatkin that now that he too has become a success, he should buy a car, a summer house, a TV set, and join their ranks, forgetting the little unpleasantness in the past.

WHILE the oppressors and bureaucrats, with their tightly guarded preserves of power, seem numerous and typical, the Lopatkins are scattered and exceptional. Besides the inventor, the positive characters consist of Drozdov's wife, who leaves her inhuman husband, falls in love with Lopatkin, helps him with money, and marries him after having been his mistress for a considerable length of time (another black mark against her in the socialistic-realistic canon); one good man on the investigating military court; a conscientious Party man in the ministry; a very old professor, who also has an invention he cannot persuade anyone to look at seriously; and a few individual workers here and there. There is no official optimism and cheer here.

Loneliness is the keynote of this novel, in keeping with Dudintsev's refutation of the myth of Soviet collectivistic happiness. Lopatkin is more alone than the most isolated outcast heroes of the novels of the Western world. He is forsaken by friends, lives in Moscow in a wretched room on his small savings, sees almost nobody, eats little besides potatoes, and works away at his invention, a solitary hero following the voice of his own conviction. The novel, rich in biblical allusions, presents him as almost a Christ-like figure, crucified by the system.

Drozdov, on the other hand, though aware of his isolation, is resigned to it. As he explains to his wife, he is too busy to pay attention to human relations. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tells his outraged, shamed wife it is only proper that she should have a private room in the hospital even if it means several other patients have to be moved into the corridor, since "all that equalitarianism is a harmful thing." He advises her not to invite any of her fellow-schoolteachers to their anniversary party, as they would be certain to envy the Drozdovs' luxurious household furnishings. "The higher you rise, the more isolated you become," Drozdov explains —in a land where pride is officially taken in being "close to the people."

Drozdov considers music, poetry, love, consideration for other people, all the qualities which make for warm human relations, to be outdated, 19th Century preoccupations. What people need now is hardness — playing the game as it must be played, riding roughshod over people if necessary.

One character in the novel suggests the official explanation for the existence of villains: bad bureaucrats are survivals of capitalism. But the other characters laugh when they hear it! Then another revolutionary explanation is given: the evil is produced by the bureaucratic system—and by human nature. By implication, both the system must be changed and human nature cultivated, not ignored or violated.

For "man lives not by bread alone," Lopatkin explains at the end, when he is being tempted by TV sets and summer houses; and here Dudintsev aligns himself with Russian authors of the past, from Dostoevsky to Yuri Olsha.

THE hero of Granin's story, *Personal Convictions,* is also a young scientist, Olkhovsky, who wants to publish an article pointing out the limitations of a new kind of motor invented by a prominent Academician. Minaev, the head of a research institute, blocks publication of the article. He insists that Olkhovsky eliminate all unfavorable references to the Academician, which cannot be done without taking away the whole point of the article. The story consists of Minaev's reactions to Olkhovsky's vain struggles to obtain a hearing for his views. Yet Minaev knows that Olkhovsky's criticisms of the motor are quite justified, but he cannot allow them to be printed because of his own dependence on the Academician and his friends.

Olkhovsky has the reputation of being a trouble-maker. He is rash and tactless. He approaches a visiting deputy minister who is inspecting the research institute and tries to present his case to him. Later he makes the mistake of publically criticizing another man who never lets an attack go unavenged.

The irony of the situation is that Minaev deeply sympathizes with Olkhovsky, whom he sees as an image of himself as a young man. He too used to dream of being courageous, of speaking his mind, but experience taught him that one must have a certain rank, a certain security of position, before one can allow oneself the luxury of being a man of principle, of having the courage of one's convictions. He decided to wait; he rose higher and higher.

The story concludes with the efforts of one of the men whom Olkhovsky

The Death of a Public Servant

In Memoriam, Herbert Norman

THIS is a day when good men die from windows,
Leap from a sill of one of the world's eyes
Into the blind and deaf-and-dumb of time;
Or by ways desperate or ludicrous
Use one of the world's machines for God's,
As George used his gun by the swimming-pool
And was found in the flamingo-colored water,
Or John, drowned in a London crater,

Saw a drowned world there before he plunged:
A baby-carriage frame, a plumber's elbow,
Memorials to his dying as he died;
Now you, in Cairo; though I do not know
How that young, dedicated intellect
Was forced away at last from its long service,
Only that Parliament says you were "killed by slander."
Wounds to your name were mortal to your mind.

Dead friends, who were the servants of this world!
Once there was a place for gentle heroes.
Now they are madmen who, scuttling down corridors,
Eluding guards, climb lavatory walls
And squeeze through air-vents to their liberation,
Where the sensitive concrete receives them
From the word's vast, abstract hate;
So they are smashed to sleep.

Or they, found wandering naked in the woods—
Numbed from the buffets of an autumn storm,
Soaked blissfully in its impersonal furies—
Are wrapped and rescued after a long dark night,
Are bustled into hospitals and baths
While the press explains away their aberrations:
"Needed a rest . . . and took no holidays . . . "
But even so, they have managed to catch their death.

I mark the fourth of April on this page,
When the sun came up and glittered on the windows
As you fell away from daylight into heaven:
The muck of Cairo, and a world silenced forever.
A poet, to whom no-one cruel or imposing listens,
Disdained by senates, whispers to your dust:
Though you escape from words, whom words pursued,
Take these to your shade: of rage, of grief, of love.

CAROLYN KIZER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

criticized to have him removed and transferred to another laboratory. Minaev visited Moscow, determined this time to be just, to defend Olkhovsky, and to enlist support in Moscow for keeping the young rebel in his present job.

Yet during the visit to Moscow, Minaev finds himself in the position of having to ask for favors for which he needs the backing of the same people who are demanding the transfer of Olkhovsky. It would not be politic to turn against them by defending Olkhovsky. Minaev says nothing and returns to his town, resigned to sacrificing Olkhovsky—for the sake of those tens of young men whom, he tells himself, he will be able to help when he rises still higher. But he knows that that moment will never come. He realizes that not only he, but his superiors and his underlings, with the very rare exception of Olkhovsky (who is defeated by the system and cast out), do nothing in the present but all wait and wait for the future; they postpone the courageous action. He thinks to himself, "Where does the past go? All that is left is expectation. All these years were filled with nothing but waiting."

The story is a pathetic, artistic presentation of a disillusioned, weak man, caught in the wheels of the machine. His career has conquered his honesty and courage; and he is presented as typical. Granin does not even make a pretense of living up to the Soviet desideratum of cheerful optimism. The story is steeped in gloom from beginning to end. The outcome is a defeat. Courage and honesty are sold to the Moloch of the industrial apparatus.

The picture of the collective, as in Dudintsev, is dark; the individual is the hero—and he does not even gain a compromise victory, as he did in *Not By Bread Alone*, but is left forsaken at the end of the story.

THE negative characters are far from being survivals of capitalism. They are simple, average human beings with good intentions, with virtuous ideals, who are warped by the system in which they operate with somewhat above-average success. The need to kowtow, to submit, to keep silent, is too great. Their form of selling their souls is to climb the ladder of Soviet careerist success. The genesis of "negativeness," then, is partly social and Soviet, partly eternal—due to human nature.

Dudintsev, Granin, and their young colleagues are attempting to brush away more than the obstacles in the path of a scientific innovator or the inventor of a pipe-casting machine. They are attacking an entire Soviet social class, a social attitude, a system and an ideology. When I spoke with Soviet writers and editors last August and September, during a month's visit to Russia, I was told of many suppressed writers who were being rehabilitated, in some cases posthumously. In the pages of magazines and anthologies, I found works of Zoshchenko, Akhmatova, Pasternak, Shklovsky, and others who could again be published. But all that was as nothing in comparison with the two works of Dudintsev and Granin. Few observers dared hope even as short a time ago as last summer that the "thaw" would produce the bold and vigorous critical images as these. Their publication probably was a sign of self-confidence on the part of the leaders in control of Soviet literature. Yet one wonders how they feel now that the relaxation of controls has yielded so much more than they had bargained for. Since December of 1956, there have been signs that the Soviet authorities are trying to do something to bridle the runaway literary revolution.

Shaking Knees with Buchwald

by Alan Levy

THE first place-dropper I ever met glanced out the train window during a slow trip from North Acton, Mass., to South Acton, Mass., and then murmured to me: "Reminds me of the ride from Munich to Dachau." I have been fascinated by his species ever since.

Place-droppers tend to breed in such stagnant areas as newspapers (where they can thrive on ample datelines and adequate bylines), travel magazines, society (also known as The International Set), the armed forces ("Join the Navy and See the World"), government agencies, and the drama and language departments of universities.

The Brave Coward, by Art Buchwald (Harper; $3.50).

Place-dropping has recently been elevated from a condition—or, at best, a practice—to an art by Art Buchwald, a chubby, cigar-smoking, 31-year-old New Yorker whose column, "P.S. From — " (the blank is usually filled by Paris, Buchwald's home base), has survived several upheavals in *The New York Herald Tribune's* ranks. Buchwald can file stories from such improbable places as Ruanda-Urundi, Lapland and Texas without displaying any more self-consciousness than a slight seizure of travel-agency bombast.

Buchwald's latest book, *The Brave Coward*, is a collection of 43 dispatches from Africa, Europe, and America. He contemplates every place with the eye of a foreign correspondent and gives even a journey through the Empire State Building the flavor of a trip up Everest by elevator. But, while the emphasis is on places, Buchwald does not overlook people. In his name-dropping moments, he can hold his own with Bennet Cerf.

"You think a lot of things when you're about to kill your first buffalo," writes Buchwald from Africa, where he has gone to defend his literary reputation. ("Hemingway has killed his leopard. . . . Ruark has killed his lion."):

> You remember a lot of people who have been close to you.
>
> As I squeezed the trigger I thought about the boys at Toots Shor's and how we used to sit around together with Leo Durocher, Joe DiMaggio, Bill O'Dwyer, Bob Considine and Tallulah Bankhead.
>
> I thought about my good friends Leonard Lyons, Earl Wilson and Ed Sullivan and how we used to hunt items together in much darker places than Africa.
>
> I thought about Sherman Billingsley. Good old Sherm . . .

The most recurrent person in Buchwald's book is Buchwald. You are there as Buchwald is manhandled by Leena, a woman who administers the best *sauna* (the native Finnish bath) in all Helsinki. You are there as he becomes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entangled in East Berlin's May Day parade; spends a Sunday beagling in Ireland; bobsleds at St. Moritz, and hunts an honest jeweler named Davud in the Istanbul bazaar. Davud's rivals inform Buchwald (almost simultaneously) that Davud "has just drowned in the Bosphorus; he had been arrested for drunken driving; he was emigrating to America; his shop had burned down; his wife was having a baby; he had just been appointed Ambassador to Yemen. No one was talking."

The cumulative effect of these short pieces—in which the scenery changes, but Buchwald remains the same—tends to make the author seem a trifle pale and quite repetitious. There is really just one joke — Buchwald's joyous cowardice when confronted by any situation. This can be as tiresome as its opposite number, the heroics in a comic strip or adventure story.

Perhaps that is why the most fantastic and amusing episode in *The Brave Coward* is one called *The Six-Minute Louvre*, in which Buchwald has only a bit part. It tells how Peter Stone, an American tourist, got through the museum in 5:56, making the required pauses at the Big Three—the "Winged Victory," the "Venus de Milo" and the "Mona Lisa" —and the innocuous tourist remark that must be made at the "Mona Lisa." ("I don't see what's so great about it.") Stone attributed much of his success to his trainer, whose advice included: "Whatever you do, keep away from 'The Rape of the Sabines' or you're a goner."

This is Buchwald at his best because he isn't pushing too hard. At his worst, he can be downright collegiate:

> It seems that the place to be at Ascot is the Royal Enclosure, where the Queen and five hundred selected people are located. It is so exclusive that up to this year no divorced persons were allowed in the enclosure, even to get a glimpse of the horses. But this time I heard that the barriers had been let down and divorced persons were being allowed in. Although it was tough on my wife, I immediately went out and got a divorce. So there I was . . .

Alliteration is one of Buchwald's defensive weapons. He revels in a travel agent's description of Lapland as

> . . . vast trackless wilds of virgin forests and naked hills, strapping spruces, sunny summits, bristling birches, earthy bots, matted moss, stilted cranes, frosty forests, boggy bilberries, fertile fields, whining willows, turbulent tundra, ranting reindeer, lonely Laplanders, lusty logrollers, wily wolves, fidgety foxes, bumbling bears, countless caves, piny paradises, raging rivers, shining streams, windy wastelands, dazzling dam sites, haughty herdsmen, doughty dogs, salty salmon, harried herrings, carefree cattle, steaming *saunas*, fearless fodder, etc., etc.

The voyage from *The Herald Tribune* to Harper & Brothers has made a few of the pieces look seasick. But disappointing as it may be, it is likely to bring Buchwald new readers and admirers. You can sense that almost all this stuff must have looked good in a newspaper column. And every now and then you realize that Buchwald is—on a part-time basis—one of the few satirists practicing in the columns of newspapers. His alleged visit to the Dallas Petroleum Club indicates that even Texas still has fertile soil for a humorist:

> "Eisenhower had no right to veto that gas bill," one of the men said.
>
> "You're darn right he didn't," I concurred.
>
> "We get eleven cents a thousand feet and the gas companies back East get two fifty a thousand," another man said.
>
> "I'd just as soon let the stuff blow into the air as pipe it out at that price," a third producer announced.
>
> "And do you know who will suffer by it?" the man on my right asked.
>
> "THE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO SUFFER —THAT'S WHO," I shouted.
>
> "You're darn right. If we can't sell our gas under the free-enterprise system the way the Almighty intended it to be sold then we might as well not sell it at all."

Here and in a section on the origin of the Parker pens sold on Rome's sidewalks (they're made by an unauthorized Parker Pen Company in Torino), Buchwald is a wonderful combination of satirist and reporter. In these moments, he outgrows his chosen world where the common brand names are TWA Constellation, Neiman-Marcus, The Istanbul Hilton, the Simca Aronde auto, and Balenciaga costumes. The International Set's life could be more than a beat for a man of Buchwald's energy. It could be the take-off point for a talented satirist who should be able to make fun of more promising targets than himself.

Mrs. Handy's Recipes for Writers

by David Ray

ON THE EDGE of Marshall, Illinois, a woman in her mid-fifties, Mrs. Lowney Handy, houses and dominates several young men with military discipline in an attempt to fulfill a dream. Already her efforts have won her fame as prophet and teacher, for her eight years' work with James Jones resulted in *From Here to Eternity*.

Some Must Watch, by Edwin Daly (Scribner's; $3.95).

Her dream is simply this: that everyone should be a writer. She has even tried to turn her 80-year old mother-in-law into a literary Grandma Moses. She believes there is a book in everyone; the trick is to find it and write it.

She has evolved an ingenious system to teach anyone who joins her colony how to put together a sentence, a string of dialogue or purple prose, and just as importantly, ideas. She has them copy verbatim the published works of Hemingway, Wolfe, Marquand and others. The purpose of "copying" is to ingest the material passively, almost hypnotically; eventually the materials copied come back to consciousness, in new combinations. By this method, James Jones once remarked to me, "Lowney can take any knucklehead and make a writer out of him."

Some writers view such methods with as much horror as a clergyman protesting the invasion of free will by hynosis. But Mrs. Handy merely explains that "Everything is grist for our mill." And out of that mill has now come another literary star: Edwin Daly.

Daly, whom James Jones describes on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cover of *Some Must Watch*, is an American answer to Françoise Sagan, portrays what the publisher describes as "a way of life typically American . . . the American boy." The volume is not offered as a juvenile, and so the reader looks for some central concern or meaning in it. It isn't there. Throughout the book, the "boy"—Richard—makes the conventional complaint that the money his parents give him is not really love, also Dad doesn't let Richard use the family car enough, criticizes his driving and won't let him have a car of his own. Both parents are guilty of talking him into going to Kenyon College instead of an Eastern school. Major events include sister's tonsillectomy, a friend's trial for statutory rape, and a trip to Michigan where Richard runs into a bunch of jerks (as well as a writer who talks just like James Jones). Young Daly follows the Handy-Jones formula of padding copy with descriptions of TV programs, movies, the content of magazines and the Sunday papers. It's always good for a page or two.

When Daly wants to describe an emotion (any emotion) he just writes: "He felt a burning sensation in the pit of his stomach" (sometimes it's his chest). Like Jones in *Eternity*, Daly has acknowledged a debt to Joyce by naming a character Bloom.

Backing up Geoffrey Wagner's thesis (in *Parade of Pleasure*) that Mrs. Handy's success is largely based on anti-intellectualism, protagonist Richard is careful not to say anything that would "sound like he was trying to be literary or something." (Many of his paragraphs end with "or something.") "I don't want to be an intellectual," he protests, "intellectual really means pseudo." When speaking of the *Kenyon Review*, Richard remarks: "It's nothing but a snobbish esoteric bunch of crap . . . which nobody can understand, not even the guys who concocted it. . . . " The jacket informs us that writer Daly has now transferred from Kenyon to Yale.

The Disconsolations of Philosophy

by William Esty

TWENTY years ago A. J. Ayer, the then *enfant terrible* of British empirical philosophy, hurled a hand grenade of a book called *Language, Truth and Logic* into the thickets inhabited by his arch-foes, the metaphysicians. The reverberations made his tract into a textbook, radical empiricism into the most repetitively deplored doctrine since Darwin, and Ayer himself into a BBC Third Programme debater-entertainer, usually coupled with a Catholic priest. The book's impact and consequent notoriety were due as much to its general tone of lucid savagery as to the specific dicta laid down, though these were often provocative enough: that the Christian God and the immortality of the soul are meaningless concepts; that ethical sentences don't *assert* anything at all; etc.

Mr. Ayer lashed out against the metaphysical enemy with the fervor of a Calvinist minister denouncing sin. His aim was to establish once and for all which statements are "meaningful" and which are not. This he achieved to his own satisfaction, using the twin tools of a criterion of empirical verifiability and a "thoroughgoing phenomenalism," combined with careful logical analysis of linguistic usages, to arrive at magnificently arrogant and summary "solutions" of all the great philosophical questions of the ages. The result was as stimulating as watching a cavalry charge: again and again Ayer's analytical sword flashed in the air, and off came heads.

But that was in 1936. Many of Mr. Ayer's opponents went right on talking, not realizing their heads had been severed. And Ayer himself has lived to write longer and more complicated books, in the most recent of which, *The Problem of Knowledge*, we may observe the ex-hussar himself rolling some philosophical marbles under the thundering hooves of the left-wing empiricists. Gone are many of the old certainties; Mr. Ayer no longer regards it as a *necessary* proposition that a person's existence is tied to the existence of his body (in this case I prefer his old, hard-shell view). Gone, with far more drastic consequences, is the old "thoroughgoing phenomenalism" itself. Mr. Ayer now believes that such an approach is an illegitimate reductionism tending to imprison each individual in a "fortress of (his) own experience." Santayana must be laughing in his grave when his suave sneers of 40 years ago at the failings of British empiricism are echoed by that tradition's erstwhile young inquisitor.

While these second thoughts make *The Problem of Knowledge* a more tortuous and less obviously exciting book than *Language, Truth and Logic*, the reader armed with patience and a love for utmost precision and lucidity of thought will find following Mr. Ayer's arguments a rewarding intellectual adventure. He will, in the book's concluding words, "gain a clearer understanding of the dimensions of our language; and so of the world which it serves us to describe." Here are no philosophical jack-in-the-boxes to startle or ointments to soothe, but William James' "unusually obstinate attempt to think clearly and consistently." *The Problem of Knowledge* is a bracing excursion into the rigors of epistemology; the fact that Mr. Ayer so often contradicts his own earlier doctrines is a sign, not of confusion nor of a weary "maturity," but of a passionate intellectual honesty persisting long after the mental fireworks of his youth have sputtered out.

The Problem of Knowledge, by A. J. Ayer (St. Martin's Press—hardcover, $4.50; Penguin Books — paperback, $.85).

ON THE BACK COVER

A special invitation is extended to present subscribers who wish to make the New Republic known to others.

Notes on Contributors

GEORGE GIBIAN is a professor of Russian literature at Smith College. CAROLYN KIZER is a Seattle poet. ALAN LEVY is on the staff of *The Louisville Courier-Journal*. DAVID RAY is editor of *The Chicago Review*. WILLIAM ESTY made his debut as a critic in this journal last fall. FRANK GETLEIN is art critic of *The Milwaukee Journal*. THOMAS ELIOT is on the Washington University faculty in St. Louis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Acheson on the Congress

by Thomas H. Eliot

THE age-old question is, how can a free people govern themselves? To this question, graduate student Woodrow Wilson addressed himself in a comparatively placid era, 70 years ago. In the threatening mid-fifties, pundit Walter Lippmann sought an answer. Now, Dean Acheson turns to the same question, in a beautifully-written small book which draws explicitly on Wilson, implicitly on Lippmann, and heavily on his own experience as Secretary of State.

Congressional Government, Wilson's Ph.D. dissertation, located the source of governmental power in the standing committees of the House and Senate. In 1888, this fresh analysis made sense. With qualifications, it makes sense today. The chief qualification, of course, is that a cataclysmic half-century has vastly increased the governing potentiality of the Presidency. The emergence of foreign policy (essentially a Presidential domain), and the election of four Presidents who wanted to be legislative leaders, combined to give the White House, as a seat of governance, more latent power than any committee ever possessed.

A Citizen Looks at Congress, by Dean Acheson (Harpers; $2.50).

Woodrow Wilson, as President, had a good deal to do with this change. Doubtless, as a political scientist, he would have applauded its continued development in the thirties and forties. And, like Dean Acheson, he might have lamented the fact that in the fifties, the possibilities of executive leadership were in considerable part shelved, while the Congressional committees reemerged, almost as strong as they were in the days of Chester Arthur or Ulysses S. Grant.

Acheson's unhappiness about this reversion is based on both theory and practical experience. Congress, and its committees, are simply not suitable instruments for the initiation of major policy. Modern complexity requires expertise—and the experts are to be found among the non-governmental specialists and the Executive branch's employees, who can and do devote full time to a particular program. In contrast, Congressmen by hypothesis can seldom be real experts on anything; they are neither single-minded researchers, nor full-time administrators. This, of course, was recognized by Congress itself in 1946, when it sought, without profound effect, to strengthen its own research resources.

In the constitutional and political structure, rather than in any inherent shortcomings of popular rule, Acheson finds the weak spot of our policy-making system. Like Walter Lippmann, he concentrates on foreign policy and urges that the executive be allowed to exercise the "power to govern," to initiate programs, with Congress playing the role of critic and watchdog. The obstacle is Congressional domination of foreign policy. The ways to surmount it are two: First, the Executive must assume full responsibility for formulating, defending, and carrying out a policy. Otherwise Congress will attempt to fill the vacuum, quite possibly with a McCarthy, a Cohn, and a Schine. Second, the Executive must persuade Congress to accept and implement the program. This requires a frank and patient Secretary of State, a readiness to sacrifice unessentials, and the co-operation of one or more deeply concerned Congressmen who have the respect of their colleagues.

DISARMINGLY urbane throughout, Acheson warms up as he proceeds from the theoretical to the practical, from a dispassionate analysis of Wilson's *Congressional Government* to sharp criticism of the Eisenhower-Dulles promises and performance. This is no *apologia pro sua vita.* There is nothing defensive about this book. But clearly Acheson feels that his record, and that of the Truman Administration's foreign policy, are things to be proud of. He uses them to illustrate the possibility of surmounting the obstacles and doing the job right—a possibility, at least, when there are men like Vandenberg in the Senate and the Executive has the sense to work closely with them, regardless of partisan differences.

Whether one agrees with the author or not, this swiftly moving essay is a delight to read. Acheson, as a writer, is like an English gentleman taking a stroll, his walking-stick casually unearthing gold nuggets as he proceeds. Among these glittering by-products is one with several facets. Acheson never mentions the old charge that he inadvertently encouraged the North Korean invasion by saying that Korea was outside of our "defense perimeter." He never alludes to the way in which Richard Nixon defeated Helen Douglas for the Senate by claiming that her voting record was similar to that of the leftist Congressman, Vito Marcantonio. But he does say this:

> If it were possible to assess the factors which led to the erroneous Soviet judgment of our probable reaction to the invasion of South Korea, the defeat in the House of the Korean Aid Bill (H.R 5330) on January 19, 1950, would bulk large. . . . Among those voting against the bill were Richard Nixon (Cal.), Case (S.Dak.), Chiperfield (Ill.), Halleck (Ind.), Vorys (Ohio), Wolcott (Mich.), Marcantonio (N.Y.). . . .

Indeed, the author of this book is much more than a writer with style. More, too, than a scholar and a gentleman. Reading these pages, we realize anew that he is also an experienced statesman and a courageous man of politics.

CUCKOO CLOCK

from **GERMAN BLACK FOREST**

Now only $3.95

postpaid . . . duty-free

Shipped Direct To You from EUROPE

This low price possible only through our unique direct import plan. Genuine German CUCKOO CLOCK with weight and pendulum movement. Excellent timekeeper. Cuckoos cheerily every quarter hour in clear pleasing voice. HAND CARVED in traditional design by the famous Black Forest wood carvers. Antique walnut finish. Shipped direct from Free Europe in export packing with strange foreign stamps. Order as gifts too, each shipped direct. (Not more than one addressed to the same person.) Send $3.95 for each. No C.O.D.'s. Postman collects the foreign packet charge which can't be prepaid. Satisfaction-or-money-back guarantee.

Ed Lurie Dept. X12
67 Warren St.
Roxbury, Mass.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ART

The Dear Dead Days

THE Karolik collection, of which a hundred and fifty paintings are now making an extended tour of the country, will fill a gap in the art history knowledge of many Americans. There are degrees of ignorance, of course, as there are degrees of knowledge. The American with an ordinary, not scholarly interest in the art of his country has the belief that it all began in the last quarter of the 19th Century with a three-headed blaze of glory called Homer, Eakins and Ryder. The same man is aware that long before these Gilbert Stuart had turned himself into a machine for painting George Washington. He may have heard of the Peales and he has a hazy notion that Sam Morse was a painter before he took up telegraphy. If anything was happening between the earlier period and the later, our man hasn't heard of it.

The Karolik collection, subtitled "American Paintings, 1815-1865" demonstrates that something was happening, all right, but not very much.

Boston's Museum of Fine Arts is the home base for the Karolik paintings and, as its director, Perry T. Rathbone, notes in the first of three introductions in the catalogue, the museum has, thanks to the Karolik donation, a pre-eminence in the 1815-1865 field that would have been inconceivable 15 years ago. The collection was put together by Mr. and Mrs. Karolik themselves before the gift to the museum and, at last reports, the widowed Maxim Karolik is still buying the stuff as fast as he can find it. Considered as an achievement in collectorship, the Karolik paintings have much to recommend them.

Collectorship, as distinguished from the art of collecting, has two aims: glory, achieved by creating a new identity out of the sum of many old ones; and cash increment, achieved nowadays by tax allowances for cultural donations to the public domain. The American collections of really great paintings have already all but lost their collective identity simply because the old masters involved had superior identities of their own. This will not happen with the Karolik collection. Many of the painters had no identity at all prior to the ingathering. What identity did exist was worn pretty thin when Karolik picked it up and gave it his own name.

THE cash increment side of the operation is equally expert. When the ingathering began, the market value of many of the painters represented was close to zero. These are the paintings that used to turn up in job lots bought by decorators for the frames or, in authentic country auctions, as parts of parcels along with hooked rugs, patchwork quilts and embroidered samplers. The very fact of the collection in progress created a price and kept it rising. By the time the donation was made, any reasonable appraisal for tax purposes would have been considerably higher than the actual amount paid for the paintings.

This technical explanation is not meant to suggest vulgar gain as the motive of the collection. It is quite clear that Karolik has a passion for his paintings, which he calls, "the unknown soldiers of aesthetic creation" and which he defends like a mother tigress against "sophisticated snobs . . . brought up solely on the 'Old Masters'." In his own remarkably obstreperous catalogue introduction, Karolik says, "The question I continue to ask is whether lack of technical proficiency limits the artist's ability to express his ideas. I do not believe that it does."

As a stylistic note, we may observe that here as elsewhere the only questions Karolik continues to ask are purely rhetorical. More important as a key to the collection, if words mean anything, the lack of technical proficiency damn well does limit the artist's ability to express his ideas. Karolik was speaking particularly of the primitives in the group. Whatever effect primitive painting has—and for every example that works in any way at all, there are hundreds that are just clumsy painting—comes not from the expression of the artist's ideas, but in spite of the attempt at expression. The untaught artist shies away from a three-quarter view and doesn't understand the bone structure of the eye sockets; thus, sometimes, we get a haunted face staring at us out of time. The same man tackles perspective without study and again, sometimes, we get a charming landscape unexpectedly "modern" in its flatness and decorative composition.

The primitives are but a small part of the selection on tour. There is about the same number of portraits done with more "technical proficiency." They remind us that one entire function of painting has been taken over by the camera. The Karolik portraits, with few exceptions, have about as much interest as an old photograph album belonging to a family you don't know.

Landscapes and genre paintings make up the majority of work on view. The genre stuff has a certain obvious historical interest. These are authentic costumes. These are the activities of the era. And the case can be made that these humble works broke the back of the aristocratic tradition so dominant in the portraits and historical tableaux of the Federal period, thus paving the way for the realism of Homer and Eakins which has continued, in one form or another, to be an enduring value in American art. But the work itself is mostly below realism or democratic art or anything else. It is illustration far below the level of homely vision to be found on the *Saturday Evening Post* cover.

SINCE the landscapes of the period were known and collected before the Karolik effort, that section is weak. Some of the known Hudson River painters are present but rarely with major works. This part of the collection doesn't approach the Hudson River show put together by Frederick Sweet a few years back. As you wander through the much too large exhibition, you get the feeling that you're looking at the same landscape over and over.

Two men in particular stand out in the show and neither is exactly a Karolik discovery. Eastman Johnson has two fine examples of his home made impressionism. Suddenly, in the blandscapes of alien corn, here is a painter concerned with painting. The same effect is made by John Quidor, whose illustrations of Washington Irving compose groups of figures instead of simply adding them up.

FRANK GETLEIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

(*Continued from page 3*)

the captive of business interests. Long before we heard of Dr. Bestor, our Teachers Union and labor leaders had protested this program in our community, where it has made no headway. . . .

The school where I teach would delight Dr. Bestor, for it provides a special course for gifted students giving them in classes of ten, 15, or 20 pupils four years of Latin, math, and science, and enabling them sometimes to go directly from high school to the sophomore year of colleges like Goucher, Radcliffe, and Smith.

But imagine my dismay when taking a group of such fourth year high school students to see a performance of *Inherit the Wind* to find that these accelerated gifted children did not accept the theory of evolution. Their classroom performance notwithstanding, their private thinking on the subject of evolution is contemporaneous with Dayton, Tennessee, circa 1925. Evidently accumulation of academic facts, skill in physics and chemistry laboratory techniques, and ability to pass College Boards do not necessarily add up to "education." *E-ducere,* to lead out; lead out to what? with what? for what?

UNA CORBETT

Baltimore, Md.

" . . . why withhold their names?"

OUR school children are taught that citizens of the United States enjoy unique privileges. Freedom, including speech, is one of these.

In recent issues of *The New Republic,* you published several letters from teachers who are critical of our educational system. These letters were not signed! Why did they withhold their names? Is it possible that those who run the schools have rejected one of the freedoms and replaced it with petty tyranny?

This has been my experience in both elementary and junior high teaching. Neither elaborate plants nor enticing salaries will tempt me to return.

But I must confess that if I were still teaching, I shouldn't hesitate to sign my name. *The New Republic* never reached my colleagues. Their intellectual nourishment came from *Reader's Digest* and professional journals. The giants struggled with *Time.*

FRANCES ENLEY

Cornell University

The New Republic welcomes communications from its readers in regard to subjects of current interest. Those of 300 words or less lend themselves to publication more readily than longer letters.

► *Nonsense and the Intellectual*

SIRS:

PROFESSOR KLING'S stimulating article on the withering away of the intellectual is only spoiled by the fact that it is based on two nonsensical premises: the future is right and gadgetry is of prime importance.

The idea that progressive improvement in the human condition is inextricably entwined with the future seems to this writer to be the ultimate in Victorian optimism. Which of us is prepared to say that Orwell's *1984* is not part of that future? The intellectual should be proud to be out of step with developments tending toward such an eventuality.

No matter how diabolically clever our gadgetry becomes it is doubtful that it will ever result in any changes in the basic human equation. If anything, our experience to date leads us to expect the contrary. Accounts of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima are brim-full of evidences of the "familiar moral and psychological categories—courage and cowardice, bravery and fear." And it is precisely these moral and psychological categories with which the intellectual is concerned.

HAROLD R. HOGSTROM

Oswego, New York

► *Faith and Reason*

SIRS:

I REFER to the review of Paul Tillich's *Dynamics of Faith* in *The New Republic for* April 1, 1957.

Mr. Weisberg deplores Mr. Tillich's use of such terms as "God," "faith," "immortality," "miracle," "ultimate concern," "total act." "In the old and happy days," he sighs, with ill-levitated petulance, "when positivists ruled the semantical universe . . . Men were men, words were words, and even theologians were not yet well versed in the virtues of ambiguity and obscurity" . . . and concludes staunchly that "we cannot forever escape our intellectual responsibilities [I wonder whence *this* serious, moral and extralogical idea derives its weight] by baptizing contradictions as paradoxes and false propositions as hidden truths."

Yet Mr. Weisberg offers us, in critical recompense, only the little dying household gods of his own logical-positivism: "empirical veracity," "confirmed empirical assertion," etc.

Who is serving gobbledy-gook to whom?

HAROLD W. HACKETT, JR.

Hollywood, Calif.

► *T.R.B. Meets the Press*

SIRS:

WE on *The Daytona Beach News-Journal* much enjoy T.R.B.'s column but therein, as elsewhere, unqualified references to "the press" rather flatten us out. Couldn't his limited space allow him at least to spell out "a *majority* of the press"? We admit, perhaps, to trying to live coolly, but within human limits, not to living "compromisingly."

HERBERT M. DAVIDSON
Editor

Daytona Beach, Florida

Complete Personality Analysis from Your Handwriting
Fee $5.00
Alfred Kanfer
62 Leroy St., New York 14, N. Y.
Endorsed by scientific authorities, hospitals, insurance companies, colleges, psychiatric journals.
Recipient of research grants

SEEKING A CONTEMPORARY HOUSE—in striking atmosphere conducive to writing, painting? Live at Greenbelt Knoll, 19 homes surrounded by woods, including two acre private park, yet within Philadelphia city limits, Holme Avenue 1 mile East of Pennypack Circle, $19,950 up. Write 5 Longford Street, Philadelphia 36, Pa., or phone Morris Milgram, Elmwood 7-4356.

GIRDLE & BRASSIERE DISCOUNT HOUSE 20% discount on your favorite standard priced girdle or bra. LO. 7-0687. E. Goldberg, 42 Thayer Street, New York 34, N. Y.

BRITISH BOOK BARGAINS—ALL SUBJECTS. Catalogues free. Transbooks, Box 22-NR, Brooklyn 26, N. Y.

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $9.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order. Unconditional money-back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue. Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

LEARN WHILE ASLEEP: Details free. Research Association, Box 610-NR, Omaha, Nebraska.

CLASSIFIED RATES

Per word (single insertion)	12c
Per word 6 times in one contract year	11c
Per word 13 times in one contract year	10c
Per word 26 times in one contract year	9c
Per word 52 times in one contract year	8c

NEW REPUBLIC
1244 NINETEENTH ST., N.W., WASH. 6, D. C.

301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. 7
PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO.,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Send 10 issues of the NR to:

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... STATE.....

I enclose $1

(Name of Donor).....

---

also to:

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... STATE.....

I enclose $1

(Name of Donor).....

---

also to:

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... STATE.....

I enclose $1

(Name of Donor).....

---

also to:

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... STATE.....

I enclose $1

(Name of Donor).....

---

also to:

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY..... STATE.....

I enclose $1

(Name of Donor).....

$1 *will bring a world of ideas to more people*

● HERE IS YOUR ONCE-A-YEAR OPPORTUNITY TO INTRODUCE THIS JOURNAL TO OTHERS FOR ONLY $1.

Most new subscribers to The New Republic have always come through old subscribers who want to spread the good word!

Fill in the names and addresses of those you wish to introduce to the *NR* — detach the order blanks on the left — and mail, along with $1 for each gift subscription to:

THE NEW REPUBLIC
1244 Nineteenth St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED